



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/537,011

01/13/2006

Guang Y Fang

013869-9004-01

1294

23409 7590 03/21/2008
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE
Suite 3300
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

LE, QUE TAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2878

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/537,011	Applicant(s) FANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Que T. Le	Art Unit 2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-16 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,6,8-16 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 4 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

This is in response to Applicants' RCE and amendment filed February 8, 2008.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The present specification fails to provide an adequate teaching/discussion regarding to the manner of "negatively and positively charged high-energy particles" being "liberated into the detector volumes" so that being detected by the detection means.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hinderer et al 7,186,986.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Hinderer et al disclose a radiation detector system comprising a radiation source (24) with a radiation propagation axis (14); a detector assembly (40, 50, 58, 70) having a plurality of (planar vanes, rods or other shapes) sheets (42) oriented substantially along the propagation axis and spaced transversely across the axis to define a plurality of axially extending detector volumes (44) for receiving radiation and generating high-energetic electrons in the detector volumes; and detection circuit or means (claim 1) for detecting negatively and positively charged high-energetic particles (at least in columns

2-4) liberated into the detector volumes to provide for substantially independent signals. At least in columns 2-4, Hinderer et al includes the discussion of possible alternative "detection structure" wherein a scintillator material, ionizing gas or other (known) material may be within the detector volume (coupled to collecting electrode, i.e. sheets). In addition, in another embodiment, the detector includes amorphous selenium material (column 7).

With respect to claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 18, although Hinderer et al lack a clear inclusion of amorphous selenium material for the detector structure of a plurality of sheets, but amorphous selenium material has been included in another alternative embodiment of tube and wire detecting structure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hinderer et al by including amorphous selenium material in the detector volume of the detector structure of plurality sheets in order to provide a desired alternative detecting performance for the system.

With respect to claims 8, 9, 12-14 and 19-21, although Hinderer et al includes a housing (column 5) for the detector system with curved shape configuration (Figures 4, 7) and/or tube and wires shape (Figure 9, 10) but lack a clear inclusion of a dielectric element with alignment means, it would have been inherently included by the configurations as shown, however, if not, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hinderer et al accordingly in order to provide a better and clearer arrangement of the detector elements/components. The further inclusion of readout electrode layer, substrate layer and/or insulation material

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for similar reasons set forth above.

Applicant's arguments filed 2/8/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Applicants arguments, on pages 7-8 of the remarks, that the inclusion of amorphous selenium material in the first embodiment of Hinderer et al would have been not obvious, this is found not persuasive because Hinderer et al, at least in columns 2-4 state that "The detector media 28 may be film, an ionization-type detector 10, a scintillation detector or other well-known detector type", wherein at least one of the "other well-known detector type" or "an alternative embodiment (of the detection structure), which includes amorphous selenium material (detector material) has been disclosed. Moreover, the use of amorphous selenium material has recently been recognized as a promising material for imaging device for medical and industrial applications, and have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art (see at least Huang 5,869,837, prior art of record). Thus, the rejection set forth above is proper.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Que T. Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-2438.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Epps Georgia, can be reached on (571) 272-2328. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Que T. Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2878